REMARKS

- Regarding the Examiners comments on the Specification, the Abstract has been revised as amended above.
- 2. Regarding the objections to claims 1, 4 and 9 for informalities, those informalities have been corrected in the revised claims as amended above.
- 4. Regarding the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11 and 12 in view of Grundy, each of said claim rejections is addressed below.

Regarding claim 1, the claim has been completely revised with new claim language as amended above.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, these claims have been cancelled.

Regarding claim 6, since this claim depends from claim 1 and since claim 1 has been amended, no changes have been made.

Regarding claim 7, since this claim depends indirectly from claim 1 and since claim 1 has been amended, no changes have been made.

Regarding claim 11, this claim has been pre-appended with the elements of cancelled claim 3, creating a new independent claim 11. Regarding the Examiner's comment on the identical nature of Grundy's plates 4, 7, 8 and 12, it should be noted that the word "identical" is a very precise term and is not limited to only selected features (i.e., rectangular cross section and bolt holes) of items deemed to be identical.

Identical means the same in all respects, which is not the case for all pairs of the Grundy plates. Specifically, plate 4 is not identical to any other plate in the set.

Applicant therefore requests a withdrawal of the stated rejection.

Regarding claim 12, since this claim depends from claim 11 and since claim 11 has been amended as an independent claim, no changes have been made.

- 5. Regarding the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claim 8 in view of Csiki et al, this claim has been pre-appended with the elements of amended claim 1, creating a new independent claim 8.
- 6. Regarding the Allowable Subject Matter of claims 4, 5, 9 and 10, Applicant expresses gratitude for the conditional allowances. In response, the claims have been addressed as follows:

Regarding claim 4, this claim has been pre-appended with the previous elements of amended claim 1, creating a new independent claim 4. Applicant understands this to satisfy the Examiner's suggestions for allowance of this claim.

Regarding claim 5, since this claim depends from claim 4 and since claim 4 has been amended as an independent claim, no changes have been made. Applicant understands this to satisfy the Examiner's suggestions for allowance of this claim.

Regarding claim 9, this claim has been pre-appended with the elements of cancelled claim 3, creating a new independent claim 4. Applicant understands this to

Application No. 10/783,992

satisfy the Examiner's suggestions for allowance of this claim.

Regarding claim 10, since this claim depends from claim 9 and since claim 9 has

been amended as an independent claim, no changes have been made. Applicant

understands this to satisfy the Examiner's suggestions for allowance of this claim.

In consideration of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully

asserts that, neither Grundy or Csiki anticipate the subject matter of claims 1 through

12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 through 12 as unpatentable

over Grundy or Csiki (as applicable) is solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that

the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for

allowance, or in the event the Examiner believes a conference would serve to advance

the prosecution of this application in any way, the undersigned attorney is available at

the number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

ZITO tlp

26005 Ridge Road, Suite 203

Damascus, MD 20872

(301) 601-5010

13

Application No. 10/783,992

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 5, 2005.

eph J. Zito

(H_J